

**COMMENTS ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL PRIORITY
INITIATIVE-PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT REPORT
FOR
PUBLISHERS PRINTING SERVICE, INC.
EPA ID NO. MDD985388487; DUMP SITE NO. MD-417
JESSUP, MARYLAND**

*Contract No. 68-W9-0005 (TES VIII)
Work Assignment No. R03019*

September 17, 1992

**COMMENTS ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL PRIORITY
INITIATIVE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT REPORT
OF
PUBLISHERS PRINTING SERVICE, INC.
EPA ID NO. MDD985388487; DUMP SITE NO. MD-417
JESSUP, MARYLAND**

*Contract No. 68-W9-0005 (TES VIII)
Work Assignment No. R03019
Project No. P520-R30*

Prepared for:
Ms. Patricia Tan
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region III
841 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107
September 17, 1992

Prepared by:
Dynamac Corporation
80 West Lancaster Avenue
Devon, PA 19333

Written By:

Thomas W. Greenman
Project Geologist

Reviewed By:

Carl Rodzewich
Deputy Geoscience Manager

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Authorization	1
1.2 Project Description	1
2.0 COMMENTS TO THE DRAFT EPI-PA REPORT	2
2.1 Comments on "1.0 Introduction"	2
2.2 Comments on "2.0 Site Description and Operational History"	2
2.3 Comments on "3.0 Environmental Setting"	3
2.4 Comments on "4.0 Waste Types and Quantities"	3
2.5 Comments on "5.0 Field Trip Report"	3
2.6 Comments on "6.0 References"	3
2.7 Comments on "Appendices"	3

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 AUTHORIZATION

Dynamac Corporation (Dynamac) performed this task under United States Environmental Protection Agency, Contract No: 68-W9-0005 (TES VIII). EPA authorized this task under RCRA Work Assignment No: R03019. Dynamac's task is to perform technical reviews of draft Environmental Priority Initiative Preliminary Assessment (EPI-PA) reports. These EPI-PA reports were previously completed under the authorization of the USEPA Superfund Program.

1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following report provides specific comments on the subject EPI-PA report. The comments are based on the information contained in the subject report; Dynamac's technical experience with EPA's, RCRA, CERCLA, and EPI-PA programs; and the resources currently available to Dynamac. Dynamac has attempted to concentrate on the technical aspects of the report as related to the RCRA program. However, comments concerning non-RCRA specific issues that may impact the overall assessment of the facility have been included. The comments are arranged according to the sections of the report. Additionally, The comments have been numbered sequentially within each section with text-specific comments appearing first and general comments following.

2.0 COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EPI-PA REPORT

2.1 COMMENTS ON "1.0 INTRODUCTION"

No specific comments were made on the executive summary; however, the final report summary should reflect the modifications to the report made in response to the following comments.

2.2 COMMENTS ON "2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION AND OPERATIONAL HISTORY"

Comments on "2.4 Site Use History"

Comment No. 1

Page 2-5, Paragraph 1: The text states that, "No information was located concerning site use prior to the property's development as an industrial complex." More research should be conducted to ascertain prior site usage since the information obtained only dates back to the mid to late 1980's.

Comments on "2.5 Permit and Regulatory History"

Comment No. 2

Pages 2-5, Beginning of Section: There needs to be a discussion within this section regarding the facility's classification status. Information such as, has the facility filed a Notification form with the EPA, is it considered a small quantity generator or large quantity generator, or neither, and the facility's EPA ID Number should be provided.

2.3 COMMENTS ON "3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING"

Comments on "3.1 Water Supply"

Comment No. 1

Page 3-2, Top of Page: The distance to the nearest well(s) should be included, not just the number of wells within a ¼-mile radius and between ¼ and 1-mile of the site.

Comments on "3.2 Surface Water"

Comment No. 2

Page 2-1, Paragraph 2: It should be mentioned whether the site is situated in the flood plain, or in flood prone area, of the Little Patuxent or Patuxent Rivers.

Comments on "3.3.3 Hydrology"

Comment No. 3

Page 3-5, Paragraph 3: A statement should be inserted concerning the depth to groundwater in the vicinity of the site. Additionally, a statement should be included regarding the assumed groundwater flow direction.

2.4 COMMENTS ON "4.0 WASTE TYPES AND QUANTITIES"

Comment No. 1

Page 4-1, Item 1: An estimation should be given as to the total quantity of dynamic blanket wash generated while used at the site.

2.5 COMMENTS ON "5.0 FIELD TRIP REPORT"

No comments.

2.6 COMMENTS ON "6.0 REFERENCES"

No comments.

2.7 COMMENTS ON "APPENDICES"

No comments.